W. G. Brantley 1000
H. F. R.
E 713
.B82
Copy 1

What is to be done with the Philippines?

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. G. BRANTLEY,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1900.

WASHINGTON.
1900.

4095

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRANTLEY.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. BRANTLEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is to be done with the Philippines? What is to be their future? What is to be the policy of the United States Government with reference to them?

These are questions that interest and concern many people. They deeply concern not only the Filipinos, but as well the people of America, and the answers to them are anxiously awaited by the people of the civilized world. Their importance can not be overstated or overestimated. Upon the answers to them depend the hopes, the aspirations, and the destiny of a people struggling for liberty; and, more than this, there are many who believe that, unless all history be false, the final answers to these questions will determine the fate of a Republic more than an hundred years old, and will settle forever the question as to whether or not a free people can perpetuate self-government or whether such a government must in time perish from the earth. If we concede the gravity of these questions—and all must concede it, no matter from what standpoint they are viewed—it is important to know who can answer them, and it is doubly important to know what the answers will be.

It is not questioned or denied that the power to answer these questions is vested in Congress and in Congress alone. The organic law so provides, and the President in his last annual message to us directed our attention to them. He said:

> The future government of the Philippines rests with the Congress of the United States.

He further said:

> Until Congress shall have made known the formal expression of its will, I shall use the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes to uphold the sovereignty of the United States in these distant islands.

In an address delivered by him in Boston, on February 16, 1899, he also said:

> This whole subject is now with Congress; and Congress is the voice, the conscience, and the judgment of the American people.

It does not occur to me, therefore, that, viewing these questions from the standpoint of the Constitution and the President's utterances, that it is inappropriate for a member of this House to discuss them, and not only to discuss them, but to suggest the answers that should be made. Indeed, I believe it not only appropriate so to do, but, in my opinion, a solemn responsibility rests upon this Congress not only to discuss these questions, but after discussion to act, and declare to the Filipinos, the Americans, and

all the world what the policy of this great Government with reference to the Philippines is.

On December 10, 1898, a treaty of peace with Spain was agreed upon, and on February 6, 1899, that treaty was ratified by the United States Senate, and the war with Spain which had, for all practical purposes ended months before, then became theoretically and legally at an end, and, so far as the Congress was concerned, the United States was at peace with all the world. Under that treaty, so ratified, it was provided that:

> The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

There are some who insist that this provision of the treaty is the supreme law for the guidance of Congress, and that, under this provision, Congress has unrestrained power to provide such civil rights and such political status for the Filipinos as the will of Congress may deem proper to provide. I do not subscribe to any such doctrine, for I believe that, under this provision of the treaty, Congress must fix the civil rights and the political status of the Filipinos in accordance with the terms and the limitations of the Constitution.

But, passing this question for the present, I would call attention to the fact that this treaty is more than twelve months old; the responsibility that it puts upon the Congress was placed there more than a year ago, and yet Congress has taken no step to formulate a policy, or to meet its responsibility, or to discharge the duties that lie at its door.

It is said, however, that Congress can do nothing, because the Filipinos are in a state of insurrection, because a state of war between them and us exists, and that until it shall have been ended and peace restored Congress should do nothing. As an humble member of this House I dissent from this proposition.

If we concede that the President, through proclamations and by commissioners, has earnestly endeavored to persuade the Filipinos to lay down their arms and to accept the sovereignty of the United States, we are still confronted with the fact that the President was and is without power to announce to the Filipino people a definite policy or to pledge the faith of this country to any given policy, because this country can have no policy and the President can commit it to none until Congress has declared one.

General Otis, in a letter addressed by him on January 9, 1899, to the insurgent leader, Aguinaldo, used this language expressive of the situation. After stating that a treaty of peace with Spain had been agreed upon, he said:

> This treaty acknowledgment, with the conditions which accompany it, awaits ratification by the Senate of the United States, and the action of its Congress must also be secured before the Executive of that Government can proclaim a definite policy. That policy must conform to the will of the people of the United States, expressed through its representatives in Congress.

General Otis also informs us, and I quote his exact language as found in his report:

> Repeated conferences were held with influential insurgents, whose chief aim appeared to be to obtain some authoritative expression on the intent of the United States with regard to the Philippines, and complained that they were unable to discover any one who could speak ex cathedra. They asserted that their Malolos arrangement was a government de facto, which had the right to ask an expression of intent from the United States Government.

Is it any wonder that the Filipinos could find no one that could speak ex cathedra as to the intent of this Government? Is it any wonder that up to this hour they have been unable to find anyone

who could so speak? The only persons who could so speak have remained silent, and they are silent until now. This Congress should have spoken long ago. It should speak now. In the light of all that has developed since this warfare began who can say, if the Congress had measured up to its duty and declared the intent of this Government to be to give the Filipinos their independence, that all the rich American blood and all the treasure that has been poured out in these islands could not have been saved?

Who can say that such a declaration now would not stop the sacrifice of life and the drain upon the resources of our people? It may be a mere theory that such a declaration would have such an effect, and yet it is a theory well founded upon the knowledge our people have of the motives and inspirations that move any people who strive for liberty and independence. It is a theory well worth the trying if we have in our hearts the determination and the intention now or in the future to accord independence to the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

Again, who can say that a declaration from the Congress before this unhappy warfare began that it was the intent of this Government to permanently retain the Philippines would not have avoided a war? Who can say that such a declaration now would not end it? If the Filipinos knew that this Government, by its Congress, had fully determined to subdue and subject them as a dependent people, is it beyond reason that dismay and discouragement would seize them and that they in despair would cease the conflict? They have been told that Congress alone has the power to announce such a determination, and they know that Congress has never announced it; they know that the treaty of peace left their civil rights and political status to be determined by the Congress, and they know that Congress has never determined them; they know that their future is in the hands of a free people governing a great Republic, and is it too much for them to expect and to believe that the free will give freedom?

If they so expect and believe, will not this belief continue to nerve them to give battle, and will not that hope continue to animate them until the hope itself is denied them? I am ignorant of the motives that impel gentlemen of the majority in this House to maintain their position of inaction on this great question, and I do not undertake to impugn their motives or the motives of anyone. I confess my surprise, however, confronted, as we are, with the possibility always of bringing this war to a close by a positive declaration of policy, that no policy is declared. I confess my surprise that, with a duty and a responsibility upon us to act and to act quickly, this Congress does not stir.

All that Congress has done has been by indirection. No affirmative action has been taken.

When the House voted to pay the $20,000,000 to Spain that the treaty provided for, all amendments looking to a declaration of policy were refused. The House was unable to declare one. Many members voted to pay the twenty millions not because they approved the acquisition of the Philippines, but because they believed that the Constitution vesting the President and the Senate with the power to make this treaty, and the treaty having been made, the same became an obligation of the Government that we were in honor bound to pay. For the same reason, without division of party, war supplies have been voted. Our soldiers without their volition were in the Philippines. They were being attacked. We could not desert them. Our flag was being fired

upon; whether rightly or wrongly we could not stop to inquire. We simply went to its rescue. [Applause.]

But, throughout it all, Congress has never announced a fixed intention or ever declared a settled policy with reference to the Filipinos.

Is it possible that we are afraid to act because some think that any action by us or any declaration by us affirming our allegiance to the principles of freedom would encourage an enemy against the United States? Are we to abdicate our functions and sit with mute lips and folded hands and await a policy to be formulated and declared by the President and submitted for our ratification? What has come over the once proud spirit of American independence—a spirit that has reached its highest acclaim in these halls—that we should sit and await the directions or instructions from anyone save the great body of the people?

Mr. Chairman, one set of commissioners have already been to the Philippine Islands, and have talked with the insurgent leaders and citizens of these islands, and have issued proclamations announcing some of the purposes of this Government. They went without knowledge of the intention of Congress and without its instructions. They have returned and have presented us with voluminous literature as to the result of their visit. We see it stated in the newspapers that another commission is about to be appointed to visit these islands for the purpose of inaugurating a civil government there. What kind of a civil government will this new commission organize? Where will it get any authority expressive of the will of the American people to organize any government? I insist, Mr. Chairman, that if this new commission goes, it should go clothed with authority from us, and should go prepared and fortified to declare in unmistakable terms what the intent of this Government is, and go with authority to establish the government there that this Congress has determined should be established.

There has been considerable talk about our duty to the flag and our duty to uphold the President. Indeed, some have gone so far as to confound the President and the flag as one and the same, and the proposition has been broadly hinted at that one could not disagree with the President without being disloyal to the flag. I feel sure that no gentleman in this House has indulged in any such talk or indorses any such sentiment. There is but one flag for all of us, and we all love it. [Applause.] This has been demonstrated in this House time and again when, without a dissenting vote, we have voted men and munitions of war for the purpose of defending it. We who hold commissions here, however, are in our sphere charged with as much responsibility as is the President. Indeed, so far as this war is concerned, there is more responsibility upon the Congress than upon the President. We alone have the power to declare war; and it necessarily follows that if we sit idly by and allow the President to wage a war, we become responsible for it, whether we approve it or not. We have not yet reached the period in the American life where freedom of speech can be denied either to the people or to their representatives, and more than a hundred years ago we repudiated the doctrine of tyrants that "the king can do no wrong," and surely there are none now in free America who are willing to invoke such a declaration.

We have the right to differ from the President. We have the right to differ with each other. We should be able to disagree

without charging "treason" or "disloyalty." No great question was ever solved by crimination and recrimination. We should discuss the great questions confronting us with all the solemnity that their importance demands.

In my opinion the questions presented by the Philippine problem are not political. They are national and fundamental. They go to the fireside in the home of every citizen. They concern the traditions and the policies of this Government from its foundation until now. They involve the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and all our glorious past. They have to do with the lives and the health of thousands of American soldiers bearing arms beneath the American flag. They should be discussed from the standpoint of free American citizenship, and not from the standpoint of any political party.

Mr. Chairman, in the limited time at my disposal I can not hope to discuss all the phases that the Philippine question presents, nor can I hope to discuss any one of them at the length and with the completeness that its importance deserves. I will not speculate upon what ought to have been done. I wish to talk of what should be done now. I submit two propositions to this House: In the first place, I insist that in the interest of peace, in the interest of our soldiers and sailors, in the maintenance of the dignity and power of Congress, and in fulfillment of our solemn obligations, this Congress should affirmatively declare a policy, whatever that policy may be, as to the purposes and intentions of the Federal Government with reference to the Philippine Islands. I submit, in the next place, with equal earnestness, that the policy to be declared should be a policy looking to the release of the Philippine Islands from the sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am not so much concerned about the style and form of government that the Filipinos should have as I am concerned that we should absolve ourselves from their government at the earliest possible day. I do not claim for the views I present any special merit of newness or of originality. I simply claim for them sincerity. I do not believe, technically and legally speaking, that we bear the same relation to the Philippines that we do to Cuba. Morally speaking, I believe the relation is the same. In the treaty of peace, "Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba," but does not cede that sovereignty to us. In reference to the Philippines, the treaty declares, "Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands." It appears from a reading of the treaty that in the case of Cuba we take the title to hold in trust, as it were, to be delivered after the pacification of the island to the Cubans, while in the case of the Philippines we take outright and to ourselves whatever title Spain had to the Philippines.

It therefore follows that we are vested to-day with just as good a title, and no better, as Spain had and held. While this is true, I nevertheless believe that when the Fifty-fifth Congress declared that the Cuban people "are and of right ought to be free and independent," they in effect declared the same of the Filipinos, because it would be absurd and ridiculous to give any other meaning to the declaration. We could not have stood before the civilized world and said, "The Cuban people are and of right ought to be free and independent, but the Filipinos are not and of right ought not to be free and independent." The declaration we made was a declaration of freedom, and, although it was lim-

ited to the Cuban people, it was so limited because they were the only people at that time involved, but the principle and the spirit involved in the declaration was as broad as the universe.

I believe, too, that when the Fifty-fifth Congress declared it to be the determination of the United States to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people, after the pacification thereof, it was equivalent to a declaration that the United States was not engaged in a war of conquest, and did not expect to demand any enlargement of its territory or any enrichment of its Treasury as the result of its victorious arms. It was a declaration so lofty and so noble that it thrilled every American heart and proclaimed again to the world that a new government, upon new theories higher and better than the Old World ever knew, existed in the Western Hemisphere. It was such a declaration as only a government founded upon liberty could have uttered. It follows, if my construction of the resolutions of Congress is correct, that, morally speaking, there is no difference between the status of Cuba and the status of the Philippines so far as the United States Government is concerned. [Applause.]

The technical difference, however, that does exist involves a difference in the course to be pursued by the Congress. In the case of Cuba a policy of inaction is all that is necessary to prevent us from embarking in a colonial enterprise there, while in the case of the Philippines and of Puerto Rico a policy of positive action is necessary to undo the entry that has already been made into a colonial venture, in order to save this country from the perils of colonial government.

Gentlemen who speak of those who oppose the permanent retention of the Philippines as mere obstructionists demonstrate that they have not given the subject the consideration that its importance deserves. The foundations of empire have already been laid. The beginning of a colonial system of government has already been inaugurated. There are those of us who would undo this wrong and who would put the ship of state back into the waters in which she has sailed so long. Those of us who wish this done desire positive action in order to do it. Those who oppose it are the real obstructionists.

In reference to our title to the Philippines, it occurs to me that our status is about this: We took a conveyance of title from Spain, and we hold by that means the paper title to the islands. When we came to take possession, however, under our title, the Filipinos interposed an adverse claim. They claimed an adverse possession and set up a prescriptive title. Those of us who have practiced law have seen many a good paper title defeated by a superior prescriptive title. When the Filipinos thus joined issue with us upon the question of title, we sought in no way to adjust our differences with them. We appealed to no peaceful forum to determine the disputed issue, and thus it followed that the issue of title was put to the arbitrament of the sword for determination. Possibly, if we had called the conscience of the world into a court, and had appeared in such a forum to test our rights, we might have had it suggested to us that Spain held Cuba by the same right that she held the Philippines; that her title to the one was as good as to the other, and we might have been asked how we reconciled the fact of our repudiation of her title to Cuba and yet held as valid and legal her title to the Philippines.

We might also have been asked, if we really believed that by her

corrupt rule Spain had forfeited her title to Cuba, if, for the same reason, we did not really believe that she had also forfeited her title to the Philippines. It might have been asked us, too, if England did not have as good title to her American colonies as Spain ever dared to claim to the Philippines, and if we now believe that our forefathers were right in repudiating the title of England. It is possible also that we might have been asked, if we now believed in the validity of Spain's title to her colonies, how it was that we recognized her rebellious colonies in South America when they disputed that title. Some of these questions might have been troublesome to answer, but, whether for that reason or for some other, we did not stop to argue or dispute the question of title, but proceeded with Army and Navy to take possession of these islands under the title that we had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that his colleague be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Believing as I do, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons given, that our moral duty to the Philippines is the same as it is to the Cubans, I insist that we should accord to them the same freedom that we propose to accord to the Cubans.

I recognize the fact, however, that, so far as the Cubans are concerned, we are neither expected to or have the right to organize a government for them. Indeed, under the treaty of peace, in which Spain did not cede her sovereignty in Cuba to us, and under the resolution of Congress declaring war against Spain, in which we disclaimed any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof, and asserted our determination when that was accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people, we have nothing to do with a government in Cuba. Our plain and manifest duty is to get out of Cuba after its pacification. In the case of the Philippines we have the technical right, under our title, to establish a government there, provided we establish it under the Constitution; nor will I stop to discuss the proposition that by the act of cession of these islands to us we assumed certain international obligations to establish a government there; nor will I stop to discuss the proposition that some obligation rests upon us to restore order in the islands for the good of the inhabitants thereof. I am willing, for all the purposes of my argument, to concede that such obligations rest upon us; but when, with the aid of the natives, whose aid we should invite, we have performed these obligations, I insist that our duty then is to get out and leave the government and control of these islands to their own people. In the case of Cuba we must get out after pacification, and in the case of the Philippines we ought to get out after the establishment of a government there, and we ought to declare now that such is our purpose.

Delay may be necessary to determine how valuable the Philippines are, but time is not of the essence in determining the great question of intention or in choosing between that which is morally wrong and that which is morally right. It will take time to perfect a permanent government for the Philippines, but no such

time is necessary to determine whether or not we intend to establish such a government. Some people say, What will become of the Philippines when we leave them? I ask what will become of Cuba, that we have already determined to leave? "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." When we have determined to leave the Philippines, I doubt not but that the wisdom and patriotism of the American Congress will find a way to carry that determination into effect, and a way by which the honor and the prestige of the American name will be sustained. When we have declared our intention, we will then determine the method of its execution. It will not do for gentlemen to say that a declaration from us would not bind a subsequent Congress, and therefore there is no reason to make it. We might with as much propriety decline to enact any legislation upon the plea that a subsequent Congress may repeal it. If we decline to declare the intention of the United States in regard to the Philippines upon such a ground, the next and each succeeding Congress may likewise decline to do so upon the same ground, and thus the Philippines would be fastened upon us forever. It is sufficient for us to perform our duty as we see it. We can not avoid doing so upon the pretext that in the future other people may not perform theirs.

Great stress is laid by some upon the strategical value of these islands to us, and it is insisted that we need a base of operations and a base of supplies there. I will not stop to argue this proposition, because I do not suppose that anyone doubts that it is within our power before we get out of the Philippine Islands to arrange with their government for whatever coaling stations and harbor facilities and commercial advantages that we desire. Indeed, I do not suppose there is an individual anywhere who doubts that we could leave the Philippines to-morrow, if we so desired, upon our own terms and our own conditions. It seems to me, therefore, that all the argument in favor of a permanent retention of the Philippines upon such grounds as these is pointless, because all that we desire, all that we need, and all that we could claim we could have without a permanent retention of the islands.

In my opinion there are but two courses open for the United States to follow in reference to these islands. If it should be the will of the American people, as represented in Congress, to permanently retain these islands, then in the resolution declaring such intention there should be included the further resolution declaring our intent and purpose either now or in the future to incorporate these islands into statehood. The only other course open to us to pursue is to vacate the islands, leaving the people thereof to control their own government whenever the same is established.

I do not believe that we have the power to annex any territory, whether by peaceable or forcible means, when we do not at the time or in the future ever intend to incorporate such territory into our Union as a sovereign State and to extend to the inhabitants thereof the rights of citizens of the United States. There are those, however, who insist that we have the right to annex territory without any such intention, and that Congress has the power to govern it outside of the Constitution. I can not assent to any such belief or any such proposition.

We have such a proposition squarely presented to us now in the pending bill, wherein it is proposed to levy impost duties upon the products of Puerto Rico into the United States, Puerto Rico now being a part of the United States. The bill is in violation of the

Constitution of our country. It is a bold announcement of an imperial policy. It can not be defended upon the ground that the tax is small. The question presented is not one of dollars, it is one of principle. It is not a question of free trade or of protection, it is a question of Constitution or no Constitution. The majority of the Ways and Means Committee who have reported this bill advise us in their report, in answer to the suggestion that this legislation will set a precedent for the Philippines, that they expressly assert by this bill the right to discriminate between Puerto Rico or the Philippine Islands and the United States.

They inform us by way of argument that it was the people of the original thirteen States who formed the Union, that it was for themselves and their posterity that the Union was formed, and they conclude and solemnly state "that upon reason and authority the term 'United States,' as used in the Constitution, has reference only to the States that constitute the Federal Union, and does not include Territories," and they further conclude "that the power of Congress with respect to legislation for the Territories is plenary." They base their conclusions largely upon the proposition that the treaty of peace with Spain left Congress with the power to determine what legislation should be enacted for the islands ceded, and that the law of the treaty is supreme.

I would suggest that before the treaty was framed the Constitution existed, and that before these islands were ceded the Congress of the United States was organized. I submit that the Constitution is the supreme authority in this country, above statutes and above treaties. The treaty-making power, existing itself by the power of the Constitution, can not confer a power to override the Constitution. Congress has no power that it does not derive from the Constitution. The President, by the help of a foreign nation and the United States Senate, can not alter or amend the Constitution. He can confer no power upon Congress that it does not already possess. He can not subtract from any power that already exists. The treaty may enlarge the territory over which the Congress may legislate, but the treaty can neither add to nor take from the limitations of power that are imposed by the Constitution upon the Congress. It is undoubtedly true that in the prosecution of a war the President may seize foreign territory. He may by treaty have this territory annexed to the United States. He may do this in times of peace.

Until the act of annexation is complete by the formal ratification by the Senate, the President may exercise military rule and maintain military government over the ceded territory. Whenever, however, the final formalities of the annexation are complete and the ceded territory becomes a part of the United States, it becomes as much a part as any State or Territory in the Union. During the formative period of organizing such a territory into a Territorial government the President may govern the same until the Congress is prepared to act, but whenever Congress undertakes to legislate for the ceded territory it must legislate under the terms of the Constitution. This proposition has time and again been affirmed by our Supreme Court. The clause in the Constitution providing that "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States" has been repeatedly construed to mean that this power is given subject to the limitations of the Constitution. It is not a despotic, arbitrary power, to be used without restraint. Congress possesses no such power for

any purpose. The power given is plenary, but plenary in the sense that it is as full and complete as the Constitution will allow. Chief Justice Waite, in 101 U. S., 132, clearly states the true construction of this clause when he says:

> But Congress is supreme and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the power of the people of the United States, except such as has been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

The same principle is enunciated in 98 U. S., 162; 166 U. S., 707; 170 U. S., 346; 114 U. S., 15; 127 U. S., 550; and in many other cases. Congress, in legislating for a Territory, assumes the powers of a State legislature in addition to its powers as the Congress. The Territorial courts that it provides have the jurisdiction of State courts as well as of the Federal courts. This is all manifestly proper, because the Congress is the only power that can govern the Territory, and yet Congress can pass no law for any Territory that is prohibited by the Constitution. It is subject always in all that it does to the limitations upon its power fixed by the Constitution.

* * * * * * *

The gentlemen of the majority, as I understand them, admit that the Constitution is supreme so long as the Congress is legislating for the States, but that the Constitution does not prevail when the Congress is legislating for the Territories. In other words, the Constitution is recognized in the United States, limited, but is unknown in the United States, unlimited. I understand from them that, in their opinion, the Constitution does not extend over any part of the vast territory of the Philippines or of Puerto Rico, and that Congress, which has no power except under the Constitution, has unlimited and unbridled power and authority to frame any government and enact any laws in these Territories that may suit its will and pleasure.

I understand from them that they believe that no restriction, fundamental or otherwise, is put upon Congress in legislating for these Territories except the prohibition of slavery. I understand from them that we can tax the people in these islands as much or as little as we please; that we are not called upon or required to give them representation before we tax them; that their consent is not necessary to any government we may choose to put upon them or to any laws that we may determine to enact for them. As I understand, further, the position of the gentlemen of the majority of the committee, they hold that the inhabitants of these islands can not be interfered with in the free exercise of their religion, because the treaty with Spain provides that this shall not be done, but that they hold that, the treaty not providing to the contrary, Congress is not bound by the limitations on its power fixed in the Constitution. I therefore understand that if the position of these gentlemen be correct, Congress may in time of peace suspend the writ of habeas corpus in these islands; may pass bills of attainder and ex post facto laws; may infringe the right to keep and bear arms; may quarter soldiers in time of peace in any home without consulting the owner; may institute unreasonable searches and seizures of the people and their houses and issue warrants without probable cause and without oath or affirmation, and may deny the right of trial by jury.

Mr. Chairman, it is enough to shock the moral conscience to know that in this day of enlightenment, when we believe the

principles of free government to be better understood than they have ever been before, gentlemen claiming allegiance to a free government should assert the right and power of this Congress to thus rule and govern a people who form a part of the United States and over whom float the Stars and Stripes which such people are expected to love and to reverence. If we carry this position to a further conclusion, we find that the Constitution prohibits the granting of titles of nobility by the United States; but if the Constitution does not apply to Puerto Rico or the Philippines, and if the power of Congress is plenary in dealing with these islands, what is to hinder Congress from enthroning a king upon these islands and creating the right of succession and providing for lords and dukes and all the court machinery necessary to create an ideal monarchy? Could anything be more repellant to the American mind? Is not the mere statement of the possibility of such a thing a sufficient argument itself against the proposition that is insisted upon? [Applause.]

I would beg to suggest that the argument of the majority of the committee that the Constitution is for the States alone is not new. It was first suggested by those who opposed the accession of Louisiana. These gentlemen were given to quoting the preamble to the Constitution, beginning, "We, the people of the United States," and saying, "It is we, the people of the United States, for ourselves and our posterity, not for the people of New Orleans or of Canada; none of these enter into the scope of the instrument." And yet those who in their day opposed the annexation of Louisiana because they believed there was no warrant or authority under the Constitution for it were overruled, and Louisiana was annexed. Those to-day who oppose the annexation of the Philippines are pointed to this past history as an answer to their objections.

The answer, however, does not appear to be all that is claimed for it, for we are now told that the opponents to the annexation of Louisiana were wrong, that the Constitution provided for it, and yet we are also told that this same Constitution, although providing for annexation, does not provide that its sheltering protection shall extend over the territory annexed. It would thus appear that we are involved in the unfortunate predicament where we must either deny the Constitution in order to annex or deny it after annexation in order to govern. It seems to be simply a question of where we will deny it, for somewhere we must lay it aside or our schemes can not go through. It seems to be a sorry dilemma in which we find ourselves, no matter which way we turn.

In attempting to pass this bill the grievances of the American colonies are pushed into the background and forgotten. We are asked to steel our hearts and close our ears to the remonstrances of our forefathers, that through the cycles of time have ever rung in the ears of American patriots and that until now we have ever believed would ring in all the ages to come. [Applause.] How soon are we asked to forget that it was a protest against taxation without representation and not a thirst for liberty that first provoked the Revolutionary war! How soon are we asked to forget those ringing and one time thought never to be forgotten words of the brave Virginians of old, when they declared, "No power on earth has a right to impose taxes on the people or take the smallest portion of their property without their consent given by their representatives." [Applause.] This principle, the Virginians said, is the "chief pillar of the Constitution," without which

"no man can be said to have the least shadow of liberty," since no man could be truly said to possess anything if other men could lawfully take away any portion of it. [Applause.]

I have no desire or intention to enter into a discussion of the legal authorities bearing on this question and shall refer to but few of them. They have been so ably presented that there is nothing left for me to say in reference to them. The Constitution provides that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It also provides that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." It also provides that "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to or from one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another." These provisions of the Constitution, it seems to me, are sufficiently clear in their meaning as to absolutely prohibit the passage of this bill. I think the language used is too plain to admit of construction, but, if any is needed, in my judgment the opinion of Justice Marshall in 5 Wheaton, 317, is all that is necessary. In this case, in construing the first provision of the Constitution I have quoted, he says:

> The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the Territories west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary on the principle of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in the one than in the other.

In addition to this I would also cite the striking language employed by the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision, in 19 Howard, 432. Gentlemen may call this language a dictum or what not, but none of them will ever successfully reply to the great truth that it so clearly states:

> There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given, and if a new State is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State and the citizens of the State and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character. The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given, and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of a territory not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority.

This bill is squarely in conflict with two provisions of the Constitution. Puerto Rico being a part of the United States, a duty upon articles imported into the States from Puerto Rico violates the uniformity of duties that the Constitution says must exist throughout the United States. In the next place, the bill in proposing a duty at Puerto Rico on all goods imported from the States into Puerto Rico not only violates the principle of uniformity, but further violates that other provision of the Constitution, that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State," for it can not be denied that this duty, although collected in Puerto Rico, is in fact an export duty on the goods sent out from any State. All the ingenuity and all the sophistry of our friends

on the other side can not refute a proposition that is as plain and manifest as this.

It is an interesting fact that when the Ways and Means Committee first undertook an investigation of this subject they were not sure as to the meaning of the term "the United States" as found in the Constitution, and they appointed a subcommittee to make research and advise the full committee as to the exact meaning of this term. As a result of this research the committee reached the conclusion that the term "the United States" does not include Territories, and they presented a most elaborate argument to sustain their conclusions, and to further establish the proposition that the power of Congress in legislating for the Territories is plenary. Now, "plenary" means "full in all respects or requisites," "entire" and "complete," and it seems to me that if the power of Congress be plenary, all discussion as to what the Constitution means is superfluous so far as this question is concerned. If the Constitution does not extend to Puerto Rico, and, if the limitations prescribed in it are not binding upon Congress in legislating for Puerto Rico, of what interest is it to know what the term "the United States" means? Or of what necessity is it to construe the Constitution at all?

I beg further to say that, in my opinion, all the authorities and all the precedents cited by those who uphold this bill are in vain; they are not precedents; they do not apply; they do not present parallel cases, because I submit that never before in the history of the Congress has it ever been attempted to legislate for any people for whom there did not exist, by treaty or declaration somewhere made, an intention upon the part of the United States to incorporate these people into citizenship and statehood. I realize, Mr. Chairman, the predicament of our friends upon the other side who favor this bill. Against their duty to obey the Constitution comes the desire not to antagonize the agricultural or industrial or labor interests of this country by admitting free of duty the products of the several islands annexed, and neither do they wish to antagonize any of these interests by removing all restrictions upon immigration from these islands.

The predicament in which they find themselves is serious. Upon the one side is the Constitution and the rights of the Puerto Rican people now, and the rights of all our other islands in the future, none of which can vote. Upon the other side are American interests, each one controlling votes. I would not charge that the latter side have prevailed in the deliberations of the gentlemen of the committee because of their power, but, reading the present in the light of the past, I am not surprised that they have done so. I do not know and do not charge that such considerations have controlled the committee in thus departing from the Constitution and from the lead of the President, whom they have been so blindly following throughout the discussion of these new questions, and yet it is an interesting thing to note the report of the Ways and Means Committee recommending this Puerto Rican tariff, and then to note the recommendation of the President in his last annual message, when he said, "Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our market," and also to note the recommendation of the Secretary of War, who says, "I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed." We note these things and wonder why the departure.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful that there are interests, and perhaps large interests, of this country that will be affected, and possibly seriously affected, by free trade between the United States and the islands recently acquired. I would avoid such injury if I could; but in my judgment, if the American people make up their minds to hold these islands as a part of the United States, they must likewise reach the conclusion to endure whatever hardships are thereby entailed. I do not believe that we of the Congress can keep unsullied the great trust reposed in us and "shut up" the Constitution to protect any interest that now or hereafter may flourish in the United States. [Applause.]

So far as Puerto Rico is concerned, no substantial injury could come to American industries by free trade with it. The island is only about 40 miles wide and 80 miles long, and all that it could produce would be but a small fraction of the production of this country. The trouble with the gentlemen of the committee is not free trade with Puerto Rico. It is free sugar from Cuba and the Philippines that they fear. They are afraid of the precedent that free trade with Puerto Rico would establish. And so with this fear, which is a fear of the protected sugar barons, they turn down the Constitution and turn a deaf ear to the appeals of Puerto Rico for relief and propose this bill. Aside from all constitutional questions, the bill should not pass because of its injustice to the Puerto Ricans. They are entitled to our markets, for we, by our act, have shut them out from all others. The Merchants' Association of New York City have investigated this question, and they have declared for free trade with Puerto Rico, in order that we may keep faith with its inhabitants and do but simple justice to them. They quote approvingly from Mr. William R. Corwine, whom their association sent to Puerto Rico to investigate trade conditions there. Mr. Corwine said:

> Place the inhabitants in the position where their trade can be extended and all will be well; but if this policy which contracts trade and increases pauperism continues, the questions which in prosperity would become minor ones will grow in importance, and instead of a feeling of contentment, which makes government easy, a spirit of discontent will arise which may render government hard. The Spaniards ruled by force. We can rule through the affections of the people. Shortened purses and empty stomachs, however, are not the bases upon which affection thrives.

As illustrating the distressing conditions which prevail in Puerto Rico—conditions that demand liberal treatment from us, that demand free trade, justice, and equality—I quote a late dispatch that appeared in the Associated Press items:

> SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, *February 17, 1900.*
>
> Several of the largest merchants of San Juan, upon being interviewed, unanimously expressed the opinion that immediate Congressional action is absolutely essential to the interests of the island. They say that the crops are immovable, the proposed duty under the Foraker bill on sugar and tobacco being prohibitive. There are now 3,300,000 pounds of tobacco ready for shipment, and by August there will be 5,000,000 pounds. The best price obtainable for tobacco in New York under the half-dollar duty is about $1.85.
>
> There has been a small coffee crop, owing to the hurricane, and sugar can not pay the duty imposed, the planters holding their products and awaiting the action of Congress. There is no money to plant new crops or to pay laborers, thousands of whom are on the point of starvation, being unable to obtain work. The estates are idle and bankers refuse to advance funds on account of the extension of mortgages; the planters are desperate and the people discouraged, and they demand absolute free trade and authority for the island to contract a loan to pay immediate expenses and for the relief of the planters.
>
> The local press expresses the opinion that the conditions of the island were better during the darkest days of the Spanish régime.

The Foraker bill would be acceptable without the duty, the merchants being willing to pay a revenue tax in lieu of the tariff, which would relieve the planters.

Undoubtedly, if we are going to permanently retain the Philippines, we should so declare, and should promptly make amends for the failure of the treaty to provide for their admission to statehood by solemnly declaring here that statehood will be given them when they are ready for it; and yet I do not believe that this will be done, for, so far as I have ever read or heard, there is no one in all this broad land who believes that these islands will ever become States in the Union, or who desires that they should so become. The character, the habits, the interests, and the civilization of the people inhabiting them are such that our Anglo-Saxon civilization, or, better still, our American civilization, would never consent that these people should have equal voice and equal power with us in the management of our own affairs. They are too far removed from us also for community of interest and action to ever exist between them and us. It is manifest that those who brought about their annexation had no thought or purpose of making them citizens of the United States, because, in violation of all precedents in the treaty-making history of this Government, those who negotiated the treaty did not incorporate therein any provision looking to statehood for the islands or citizenship for their inhabitants.

Gentlemen of the other side and as well those elsewhere who favor the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands are free to quote precedents, and to say that they are but following in the tracks marked out by our forefathers in the beginning of this Republic. I wish to take issue with this position. As I have already pointed out, there is no parallel in all our past history to the proposition now pending to permanently retain the Philippine Islands without any declaration of intention to ever accord them statehood. The parallel between the present case and our past history also fails in that all our past annexations have been in the main annexations of territory and not of people.

The annexation of the Louisiana territory is most frequently cited as justifying the annexation of the Philippines. I wish to call attention to the fact that at the time of the annexation of Louisiana that, aside from the constitutional questions that were raised, and to which I have already adverted, the burning question at that time was the fear that this great territory, after it became populated, would become all-powerful in the Union and would dominate the Government to the exclusion of the East. Certainly no such question exists now as to the Philippines.

Texas was objected to, among other grounds, because it was claimed that its annexation was but a scheme to extend the slaveholding territory and increase the strength of the slaveholding States. This objection might be somewhat pertinent now in the light of the treaty our Government has consummated with the Sultan of Sulu, by which treaty the United States not only agrees not to interfere with but to protect the people of the Sultan in the free exercise of their religion and customs, social and domestic, which customs include slavery, but also, as an evidence of the good faith of this Government in so agreeing, General Otis offered a present to the Sultan and datos of $10,000, Mexican money, and agreed to regularly supply sums of money thereafter in accordance with the previous agreement of Spain.

In reference to the Louisiana purchase, I would call attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the assaults that were leveled at Jefferson, that great statesman, before he ever treated with France for a cession of the Louisiana territory, transmitted to the Congress on December 15, 1802, his message calling attention to the cession of the Spanish province of Louisiana to France; and again, on January 11, 1803, he transmitted his message to the Senate nominating a minister plenipotentiary and a minister extraordinary and plenipotentiary to treat with both France and, if necessary, Spain, in reference to obtaining a cession of this territory. It thus appears that his purpose, whether held to be wise or unwise, was not concealed in his own bosom. The same was communicated to the lawmaking power, and both the lawmaking and the treaty-making power of this Government were in his full confidence in the very incipiency of the negotiations for this cession. Does that parallel exist in our negotiations for the Philippines?

I would also remind our friends on the other side that Jefferson convened the Congress in extraordinary session on October 17, 1803, after the treaty of cession was agreed upon, and in his message to Congress on that day used this American language:

> With the wisdom of Congress it will rest to take those ulterior measures which may be necessary for the immediate occupation and temporary government of the country; for its incorporation into our Union; for rendering the change of government a blessing to our newly adopted brethren; for securing to them the rights of conscience and of property; for confirming to the Indian inhabitants their occupancy and self-government, establishing friendly and commercial relations with them, and for ascertaining the geography of the country acquired.

He thus announced in the outset that, so far as his Administration was concerned, our newly acquired citizens were brethren; that their territory was to be incorporated into our Union, and that self-government would be continued to them. It is unnecessary for me to remind gentlemen that the treaty with France itself stipulated that Louisiana should eventually be incorporated as a State. If we are going to cite the Louisiana purchase as a precedent for annexing the Philippines, must not we, in order to justify ourselves entirely, go the length that Jefferson did and announce statehood and self-government for the Filipinos?

It may not be out of place for me to call attention to the fact that at the time of the annexation of Louisiana it was vital to the young American Republic to control the Mississippi River. Time and again the right of deposit in New Orleans had been denied them. They were confronted with the fact that this great river and the vast territory of Louisiana had been ceded by Spain to Napoleon, and that the great Emperor proposed to reorganize on a grand scale his French colonies.

The safety of the young Republic, to say nothing of its commerce, demanded that this should not be done, but that our Republic, in the interest of peace, in the interest of its perpetuity, and in the interest of its commerce, should control this river and this territory. Such was the situation then, and, reading into the future, Jefferson, with unfaltering wisdom, acted. Is there a parallel between that situation and the present? Is not the Philippine situation just the reverse of that? Then our fathers were welding together a compact territory on this continent; now we are crossing a great ocean and invading another continent. Then our fathers acted in the interest of peace and sought to promote and preserve it; now we throw peace to the winds and

challenge war. Then our fathers sought to preserve that which they had: now we, to feed a thirst for glory and for greed, imperil that which we have. Then our fathers sought to bestow liberty; now we to deny it. Then our fathers sought to avoid European and eastern entanglements; now we deliberately invite them. [Applause.] Then our fathers were humble worshipers at the shrine of liberty, seeking to dedicate this country to the sacred cause of freedom; now we feel that we have become a world power and are seeking to exhibit to the world our strength and our might.

It is an interesting fact that, notwithstanding the potent arguments in favor of our obtaining Louisiana, Jefferson doubted and hesitated as to the power of this Government to annex it, and it is written that he talked of calling for a constitutional amendment that would authorize and justify that which had already been done. It was subsequently determined, however, that this was unnecessary. No such qualms of conscience as this affect the expansionist of to-day. Starting from the standpoint of what Jefferson did and ignoring what he thought, they go beyond him, beyond all the fathers and all the traditions and all the precedents, and propose to centralize here in Washington, outside the pale of the Constitution, the control of the happiness, the fortunes, the aspirations, and the government of more than 10,000,000 human souls, and they situated thousands of miles away from our farthest western shore.

As illustrating the views and the opinions of the expansionists of old, and to show the striking contrast between them and the expansionists of to-day, I beg to call attention to what President Polk said in his message of December 2, 1845, in reference to the annexation of Texas:

> This accession to our territory has been a bloodless achievement. No arm of force has been raised to produce the result. The sword has had no part in the victory. We have not sought to extend our territorial possessions by conquest or our republican institutions over a reluctant people. It was the deliberate homage of each people to the great principle of our federative Union.

When our President of to-day comes to write the history of the annexation of the Philippines, can he quote the language of President Polk?

President Polk further, in his inaugural address, in favoring the policy of expansion, used this significant language:

> It is confidently believed that our system may be safely extended to the utmost bounds of our territorial limits, and that as it shall be extended the bonds of our Union, so far from being weakened, will become stronger.

The expansionist of to-day ridicules the idea of there being any limit to our expansion, and yet the expansionist of old, as shown in the address of President Polk, believed that there were limits to our expansion. That the farthest extent of these limits were the limits fixed by the Western Hemisphere I do not suppose anyone doubts.

President Polk is not the only statesman of old who believed that there were limits to our expansion, for we find that in the second annual message of President Monroe he said:

> By extending our Government on the principles of our Constitution over the vast territory within our limits on the lakes and the Mississippi and its numerous streams new life and vigor are infused into every part of our system.

The great Daniel Webster also said:

> There must be some limit to the extent of our territory, if we would make our institutions permanent.

The Monroe doctrine, so called because of its forcible presentation by President Monroe, although it had been the settled policy of this Government from its organization, is thus stated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823. After referring to the struggle of the Greeks for liberty and briefly to the affairs of Spain and Portugal, he says:

> The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments, and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.
>
> With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Is not the justice and righteousness of the Monroe doctrine based on the declared policy of this Republic not to interfere in European affairs? For a hundred years or more we did not seek to extend our system of government into the Eastern Hemisphere, and the Eastern and European countries have not extended theirs here, but have held aloof out of respect to the Monroe doctrine. It is true that now and then foreign powers have pretended to sneer at the pretensions of this doctrine, and yet none of them have dared to violate it. Upon what reason and upon what justice can we maintain it before the enlightened judgment of mankind if we deliberately remove our main justification and defense of it? If we can invade Asia, and feel justified in so doing, why can not Germany or some other country invade some portion of the Western Hemisphere not occupied by us and feel justified in so doing? If we pursue the course of planting our system of government in the Eastern Hemisphere, will not the question of maintaining ourselves there and here be simply a question of power and of might and not a question of right? Will not the equity we now have be gone, our defense be destroyed, and we left to stand solely by the strength of our good right arm, unsupported and unsustained by the righteousness and justice with which we have heretofore been armed?

There are those who talk about the annexation of Florida as a precedent for annexing the Philippines, and yet it was President Monroe, who enunciated the famous Monroe doctrine, who negotiated this treaty. At the time of that annexation the Monroe doctrine was in full force, and the annexation of Florida so far from weakening it emphasized and strengthened it. Annexation of the Philippines tends to destroy it. We all know that at the time of the annexation of Florida our country was harassed and disturbed by roving bands of savages and outlaws in the penin-

sula of Florida, which Spain could not or would not control. To protect ourselves, we had to control the peninsula, and in addition to this imperative fact we needed the peninsula of Florida for the national defense. We needed to control its shores, lapped as they are by the waters of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. Our treaty of cession also provided that Florida should have statehood.

Do any of the arguments or any of these conditions applicable to Florida apply to the Philippines?

President Monroe also had ideas about our General Government that the expansionist of to-day will hardly approve. He said:

> The impracticability of one consolidated Government for this great and growing nation will be more apparent and will be universally admitted. Incapable of exercising local authority except for general purposes, the General Government will no longer be dreaded.

Will the expansionist of to-day admit the impracticability of a consolidated Government, when they propose to have such a Government control and govern more than 10,000,000 people? Will the expansionist of to-day admit the incapacity of the General Government to exercise local authority except for general purposes, when they propose to have the General Government exercise both general and local authority for millions of subject people?

There are other expressions from the fathers of old that accord with the position of those who oppose the permanent retention of the Philippines, but do not accord with those who favor such retention. Fillmore declared, in his first annual message:

> Among the acknowledged rights of nations is that which each possesses of establishing that form of government which it may deem most conducive to the happiness and prosperity of its own citizens, of changing that form as circumstances may require, and of managing its internal affairs according to its own will. The people of the United States claim this right for themselves, and they readily concede it to others. We make no wars to promote or to prevent successions to thrones, to maintain any theory of a balance of power, or to suppress the actual government which any country chooses to establish for itself.

The sentiments herein expressed met the approval of every American heart when they were uttered, and I can not believe that such sentiments are not in accord with American feeling and American sentiment to-day. And yet this Government is engaged in refusing to the Filipinos the right to their own form of government, and with force of arms is engaged in suppressing the actual government which the Filipinos chose to establish for themselves. How the mighty have fallen from their high estate! When our President of to-day comes to write of the Filipinos, will he quote with approval this message of President Fillmore?

There are those who profess now to believe that the Declaration of Independence no longer exists for our guidance and control. They profess to believe that we have passed the day when we should be moved by the sentiments and the principles enunciated in that immortal Declaration. They profess to believe that it has never been a part of our Government; but that, for all practical purposes, it perished with the creation of our Constitution. Such thoughts and such sentiments have not always existed. As late as the Administration of President Taylor the Declaration of Independence was alive, as listen to his message referring to the proposal to qualify the terms of California as a State. He said:

> In attempting to deny to the people of this State the right of self-government in a matter which peculiarly affects themselves will infallibly be regarded by them as an invasion of their rights, and upon the principle laid down in our own Declaration of Independence they will certainly be sustained by the great mass of the American people.

He further asserted in this message another doctrine that I assume is totally repugnant to the expansionist of to-day. He said:

To assert that they are a conquered people, and must, as a state, submit to the will of their conquerors in this regard, will meet with no cordial response among American freemen.

Is not the position of our Administration to-day in reference to the Filipinos that until they admit that they are a conquered people we will not even deign to tell them what we intend to do with them? Where in all our history is there a parallel to such a position?

A distinguished gentleman who was elected to this House to sit on this side of the Chamber, but who, as I understand him, has voluntarily elected to be known as belonging to the other side, has called our attention to the fact that Mr. Buchanan, whom he says is the last Democratic President we have had, was an expansionist and favored the purchase of Cuba. I am glad that our friend has referred us to this fact, because it furnishes the opportunity to give to the House the benefit of the views entertained by Mr. Buchanan, and I commend these views to the careful consideration of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all his compatriots upon the other side. Mr. Buchanan said in a message:

It has been made known to the world by my predecessors that the United States have on several occasions endeavored to acquire Cuba from Spain by honorable negotiation. If this were accomplished the last relic of the African slave trade would instantly disappear. We would not, if we could, acquire Cuba in any other manner. This is due to our national character. All the territory that we have acquired since the origin of the Government has been by fair purchase from France, Spain, and Mexico, or by the free and voluntary act of the independent State of Texas in blending her destinies with our own.

In his inaugural address he said:

It is our glory that whilst other nations have extended their dominion by the sword we have never acquired any territory except by fair purchase, or, as in the case of Texas, by the voluntary determination of a brave, kindred, and independent people to blend their destinies with our own.

He also said:

Our past history forbids that we shall in the future acquire territory unless this be sanctioned by the laws of justice and honor.

How will the record of our acquisitions stand when we are through putting the Filipinos to the sword and have seized their land as our own?

Alaska is sometimes referred to as a precedent for the annexation of the Philippines, but, aside from the fact that Alaska is not contiguous territory, there is no parallel in the two cases. In the first place, Alaska at the time of annexation was unpopulated, and the annexation was of land and not of people. Even to-day the last estimated population of Alaska, as furnished in the last Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, shows a population, all told, of only 55,064, and this thirty-two years after annexation. Is there any parallel between this and the annexation of ten or twelve million human souls in the Philippines?

A further and more striking difference lies in the fact that it is conceded that whenever Alaska is prepared for it she will be admitted to statehood. Nobody disputes this. Congress has recognized Alaska as a part of the United States by enacting legislation for it, and Congress can not legislate for any country that is not a part of the United States, and no country can be a part of the United States and not be under the protection of its laws and Constitution. In the act of 1898 in reference to Alaska Congress distinctly recognized the right of statehood in Alaska by declaring

that this act should not be construed "as impairing in any degree the title of any State that may hereafter be erected out of said district or any part thereof to tide lands and beds of any of its navigable waters," etc.

In my opinion, however, Alaska furnishes an object lesson against the permanent retention of the Philippines and against a colonial policy. Our government of the Territory of Alaska demonstrates the inadequacy of our system to govern and care for a dependent and subject people. The theory of our Government is that there are no rulers but the people. There is no provision and no place and no power to govern except by the people. When we undertake to say that "we, the citizens," will govern "you, the subjects," we find no machinery at our disposal, and the result is misgovernment. It is worse: it is anarchy.

As an illustration of how Alaska is governed, the Secretary of the Interior, in his last annual report, says:

> Attention is called to the anomalous condition of the land laws in the district. There are no surveyed lands, nor has any system of surveying been provided, rendering it next to impossible for a poor settler to acquire a homestead. Citizens who have resided in the district for thirty-two years have as yet been unable to secure title to the lands they have occupied.

Think of it! For thirty-two years we have owned Alaska, and yet to-day no citizen of that district has been able to acquire a title to the land that he has bought, occupied, and improved. [Applause.] What greater commentary upon our incompetency to provide for a subject people could be suggested? The people must provide for themselves, or their wants and needs will never be satisfied.

But listen further. The Attorney-General, in his last annual report, says:

> The administration of affairs in Alaska, and especially the administration of justice through the courts and court officers assigned to that Territory, is not satisfactory. There has been during the past year a very great increase in the amount of legal business in Alaska. The report of the district attorney shows that the criminal business has doubled within a year, and the civil business has multiplied five times over. Complaints of the inadequacy of the provision to establish law and order are almost universal. The district judge advises me that because of a lack of time not one-tenth of the business presented can be disposed of. Officers of the Army exercising command in the Territory report that the insufficient appropriations for the Department of Justice and the lack of a sufficient force of court officials render the administration of justice along the Yukon abortive, and that the average citizen dwelling in that region has but very little respect for it.

Here we have it stated that after thirty-two years of our administration we have not provided the means to dispose of one-tenth of the business brought to our courts, that complaints of the inadequacy of our provisions to establish law and order are almost universal, and that our administration of justice—American justice, if you please, of which we boast—is such that it inspires no respect among the natives. Can we wonder that the town of Wrangell has asked to be transferred to Canada, has asked to be transplanted from underneath the sheltering folds of our glorious flag, simply because that flag as it floats in Alaska does not mean good government, good laws, and justice?

Can we wonder that this state of affairs exists when Governor Bradley, of the Territory, is quoted as saying:

> There are 60 men in charge of the government of the Territory. They have no interest in Alaska, except to grab what they can and get away. They are like a hungry lot of codfish. Seven of these officials, 11 per cent of the entire government, are now under indictment for malfeasance in office.

Is not this but a repetition of the world's history that men can

not be trusted to rule an alien people in an alien land, where they have no interest to subserve save the emoluments of office?

What stronger argument can be offered against a colonial government than this statement of facts reveals? [Applause.]

As further illustrating our want of proper machinery to govern colonies, we have immediately before us the deplorable condition of affairs in Hawaii. We annexed these islands more than a year and a half ago. We have not yet given them a Territorial form of government, and in the formative period of their existence we have not provided them with any laws by which they can maintain themselves. Their legislature became extinguished with the ratification of the treaty of annexation, and now, with the bubonic plague devastating their land, carrying suffering, want, and death in its wake, there is no power to authorize the expenditure of money in providing treatment and in attempting to crush the disease. We are told by the newspapers that the President and his Cabinet have been anxiously consulting in reference to the condition of these people and have been seriously trying to devise some way for their immediate relief. It must be apparent to everyone that, in order to govern a subject people, there must be arbitrary power lodged somewhere that can act quickly. There is no place under our Constitution where such power can be lodged; and if Congress undertakes to vest it anywhere, it must do so without warrant or authority from the Constitution and without regard for the first principles of freedom, for it has been well said that "the history of the world has been written in vain if it does not teach us that unrestrained authority can never be safely trusted in human hands."

Mr. Chairman, Alaska and Hawaii are not the only instances in the history of this Republic that have demonstrated the folly and the wrong of a republic attempting to govern any people except by democratic methods. Here in this Union the Southern States have known the effect of such a government. The people of the South know what it is to be governed without their consent. They bitterly know the horror, the injustice, and the iniquity that such a government entails. They know what it is to have no voice in their affairs, to be taxed without representation, to be governed by aliens, and to have military rule supplant the civil law. I mention these things not to awaken unpleasant memories or to reopen wounds or to scar afresh old sores that burrowed deep in the flesh. The memory of these things is fast dying out, and I would not revive it, nor do my people desire that I should do so; but I mention them to emphasize the statement that as a representative of these people I will never by my vote or voice consent to put such a government upon any of God's people in any clime, beneath any sun, in any part of this earth. [Applause.]

I would not do it as a matter of sentiment for the subject people, but, above and beyond this sentiment, I would not do it for love of the American people and American institutions, because I believe that to do so would be to set a precedent that in its effect would ultimately overthrow the liberties of our own people. If there be no other way to govern the people of the Philippines except through despotic and arbitrary government, and if we are determined to govern them, then let us amend the Constitution before we undertake such a government, for I believe with Washington that—

If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amend-

ment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for * * * it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

I equally abhor with Daniel Webster a military republic, and, as applicable to the present discussion, I recall his utterance of more than half a century ago, when he pronounced—

A military republic a government founded on mock elections and supported only by the sword; as a movement, but as a retrograde and disastrous movement, from the old-fashioned monarchical systems.

And I recall that at the same time he declared:

Above all, the military must be kept, according to the language of our Bill of Rights, in strict subordination to our civil authority. Wherever this lesson is not both learned and practiced there can be no practical freedom. Absurd, preposterous, a scoff and a satire on free forms of constitutional liberty for frames of government to be prescribed by military leaders and the right of suffrage to be exercised at the point of the sword.

Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself, I do not want the Philippine Islands either out of the Constitution or under it. I do not wish to have them as a part of this Union. In passing, however, I would say that with a declaration proposing to admit Puerto Rico ultimately into statehood I would interpose no objection to permanently retaining it, provided the people of Puerto Rico desire us to keep them. I would interpose no objection either to Cuba, under the same conditions, becoming a part of this Union. These islands are differently situated from the Philippines. They are within the legitimate sphere of our influence; they are within the Western Hemisphere, and they lie almost at our door. They may be of strategical value to us. We would violate none of our time-honored principles in annexing them. The Monroe doctrine would not be interfered with. We could defend them far easier from hostile invasion than we could defend the Philippines, and we could perhaps the better protect the Atlantic coast from the invasion of yellow fever by annexing them.

I am opposed to forcibly annexing any people, and it is inconceivable to my mind that this country, boasting of its free institutions and glorying in its past achievements for liberty, should commit itself to the attempt to force its flag over an unwilling people. [Applause.]

I am opposed to retaining the Philippines because I am opposed to a large standing army. Before the war with Spain an army of 25,000 men was as large as we needed. It was ample to meet all the needs of a free people. The war with Spain necessitated an increase in this army, and yet, although this war ended more than a year ago, the taxpayers are still supporting a great army, and all because of the Philippines. No man to-day can tell when this army will be disbanded; no man can predict when what we are pleased to call the "insurrection" in the Philippines will end, and no man can say how long it will stay ended whenever an end is reached. The history of these islands offer us but little hope that we could with safety withdraw our army, even though peace with them should be declared. The retention of these islands, it seems to me, therefore makes the retention of the army a necessity, and upon the other hand, no man will deny the proposition that with the release of the islands the army will not be necessary.

I am opposed to retaining these islands because of the expense. It is stated that the normal cost of the Government prior to the war with Spain was, in round numbers, $5 per capita, and it is now stated that this expense is $8 per capita. We thus have an

increase of $3 per capita, or a total of over $200,000,000 per year, and all because we own the Philippines and the foolish natives of the islands have disputed our title. The war taxes are still collected, although peace is declared. These taxes fall upon every home and every workshop. Their imposition has already lasted too long, and the burden they entail should be lifted instead of being permanently fastened upon our people, as the retention of these islands will necessitate.

I am opposed to retaining the Philippines because I am opposed to a one-man government in any land that flies the United States flag. I do not believe in centralizing power in the White House. I do not believe in enlarging the already too great power that is now vested there. I do not believe in a strong centralized government.

I believe that those people are governed best who are governed least, and I believe that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." I have no faith in the theory that has been suggested that the government we would establish in the Philippines would be so clean, so pure, and so able that its image reflected back to us would make this Government more pure, more clean, and more able. Rather than this, I fear that an autocratic government there would eventually result in an autocratic government here. If self-government can be denied in any one part of the United States it can be denied in all parts. If we accustom ourselves to the use of arbitrary power in one place, it will become natural and easy to use it in all places. When we consent to a government of the Filipinos, who have become a part of the United States, at the point of the bayonet, let all patriots remember that at the same time we are increasing the number of bayonets. As we increase despotic power we must remember that at the same time we are increasing the armed force to maintain it. Is not this dangerous, desperate ground to enter upon? The part of prudence and the part of safety is to withdraw from it before it is everlastingly too late.

Learned gentlemen and able gentlemen have talked about the inherent powers of this Government. We hear it claimed that whether the Constitution provides for it or not, this Government possesses the same powers of all other great governments. Mr. Chairman, this Government has no power that the Constitution does not delegate to it; for, by the language of the Constitution, all other powers not so delegated are prohibited. If the framers of this Government had supposed that in its creation they were giving to it the despotic powers of the governments of old, would they ever have established it? They were seeking to escape from such powers. They sought here in the New World to found a new government, and, ignoring all precedents, they blazed a way of their own. They profited by the experience of past governments and eschewed the vicious elements of all those governments from theirs.

The foundation upon which they laid their structure was freedom, and upon this foundation they reared a superstructure dedicated to liberty. It is now seriously proposed after a century of experience with this Government to deliberately remove the foundation upon which it is built, and to assert that the wise fathers of old had framed a government with all the despotic powers of the Old World. The proposition, it seems to me, is monstrous.

Unless our forefathers blundered in their work, and it has taken one hundred years to find it out, if true, the United States Government can not do anything that any other government can and still be the United States.

I have no patience with those who claim the hand of destiny is guiding us in the Philippine question. Those people who so claim are simply uninformed as to the facts. It was not the hand of destiny that in August, 1898, cabled to Admiral Dewey, saying:

> The President desires to receive from you any important information you may have of the Philippines, the desirability of the several islands, * * * and, in a naval or commercial sense, which would be the most advantageous.

That telegram was sent from the Navy Department by direction of the President. There is nothing of destiny in it. There is no suggestion of a derelict people drifting into our hands for whom we must provide. It is a cold-blooded business inquiry. It was not the hand of destiny but the hand of our Secretary of State that, on July 30, 1898, named as the third condition that the United States would require of Spain, in the event of a cessation of hostilities, that—

> On similar grounds the United States is entitled to occupy and will hold the city, bay, and harbor of Manila pending the conclusion of the treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition, and government of the Philippines.

Destiny did not make itself manifest until after the cablegram to Admiral Dewey had been answered and our peace commissioners had gone to work to perfect the treaty and had received their instructions to demand the Philippines. The whole transaction was one of business, of barter and sale, without the intervention of destiny. It yet remains to be seen whether the business deal, as it was finally consummated, will be ratified by the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is not the civilizer of the world. We wish that all countries had our civilization and that they all had a government like ours. The only way, however, that we can assist them to obtain that which we have is to keep ever before them an ideal government in all its pristine purity and glory. We can teach them by example and by precept, but we can not teach them by force. I can well understand how the course we have pursued so far in reference to the Philippines has created alarm among civilized people everywhere. An English writer in the London Chronicle says:

> If we express our disappointment as Englishmen that our American kinsfolk are apparently following our example, it is because in the matter of the rights of every people to govern themselves we had looked up to them as about to show us the better way by respecting the aspirations toward freedom even of less advanced races, and by acting in accordance with their own noble traditions and republican principles.

The noble and disinterested purposes for which we declared war against Spain raised the United States to the topmost pinnacle of the great and humane governments of the world. If we had but lived up to the renown we then won, or if we would live up to it now, in my humble opinion we would accomplish more for freedom, more for good government, more for humanity, and more for the United States than all our armies in a century of time can hope to accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, in all that I have said I have not discussed the Filipinos themselves. My concern has not been for them, but for us. I have had no intention, and have none now, by anything

that I say to encourage them in their hopeless fight. I have no fear of doing so, because no feeble words of mine could add to the eloquent words of freedom and of liberty that line the archives of our nation from the Declaration of Independence until now, and no act of mine could stir a patriotic heart as the history of our glorious deeds, achieved in freedom's name, must already stir it. I believe that the Filipinos should submit, if for no other reason than because they can not succeed. I believe they can accomplish more by peaceful methods than by arms, and yet I trust that I will be pardoned if I say that a careful reading of all the information furnished us about them shows that, notwithstanding all statements to the contrary, they seek and crave liberty. The excellent gentlemen composing the peace commission sent by the President to the Philippines say a great many things in their report, and among these things I find this statement:

> While the people of the Philippine Islands ardently desire a full measure of rights and liberties, they do not, in the opinion of the commission, generally desire independence. * * * The Philippine Islands, even the most patriotic declare, can not at the present time stand alone. They need the tutelage and the protection of the United States, but they need it in order that in due time they may, in their opinion, become self-governing and independent, for it would be a misrepresentation of facts not to report that ultimate independence—independence after an indefinite period of American training—is the aspiration and goal of the intelligent Filipinos who to-day so strenuously oppose the suggestions of independence at the present time.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that Aguinaldo and his followers desire independence, because they have asked for it and are now fighting for it, and here we have the statement of our commission that the balance of the Filipinos also desire it. Who is promising it to them? Who is holding out any hope that at any time in the future their aspirations will be granted?

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the retention of the Philippines, because I am opposed to this Government acquiring any territory in the Eastern Hemisphere. To retain these islands would mean our entrance into and participation in the ever-arising and ever-perplexing questions of the East. It would convert us from a peace-loving into a warlike nation. The Eastern world, in dealing with questions of government, recognizes only the law of might. This is made manifest in the large and ever-increasing armament of the countries of the Old World. Invading, as we would be, the territory of the Old World governments, who can say that we could maintain ourselves there and avoid entanglements or alliances with other nations? I am not yet ready to do this. I am not yet ready to reverse the declaration of our policy made by Jefferson when he said:

> Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Nor am I yet ready to discard and refute the parting words and advice of the first President of this Republic when he said:

> Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

To retain these islands would mean not only a large standing army for the purpose of upholding our Government among the islanders, but it would also mean such an army for the purpose of defending them from outside interference. It would mean a great army and a great navy, because these islands are so far removed from our shores that we could not rely upon our volunteer forces to defend them. We would have to be ever ready for war, just as all Europe is to-day.

In the research that I have made on this great question, Mr. Chairman, I have not lost sight of the materialistic argument that has been presented in favor of the permanent retention of these islands, and, while I have reached the conclusion that the view thus presented has been exaggerated and has been given more importance than the facts justify, yet I am frank to say that no consideration of commerce or of gold, and no thirst for empire ought, in my opinion, to be weighed in the balance against the Constitution and liberty and the perpetuation of our free institutions.

Some part of this Government, however, invested with power, has been pandering to whatever of cupidity there may be in our natures in the style of literature with which they have supplied us. I have received Government publications which set forth in glowing language the rich stores of gold and of silver, of coal, of iron, and of copper to be found in the Philippine Islands, and describing the great fertility of the soil, and pointing out the marvelous results that American energy and American money can achieve in these islands. When I come to read, however, that portion of this literature devoted to the facts, I find that the foreign commerce in these islands in 1894 was as much as it was ever known to be, and that in this year it amounted to only $23,558,552 of imports and $33,149,984 of exports. In the tables for other years the figures are smaller.

When we remember that if we handle this entire commerce, both exports and imports, we could only expect a legitimate profit out of it, we can realize what a pitiful return we would get for our great investment of money, leaving out of consideration entirely the precious American lives that have been sacrificed and will be sacrificed to obtain it. Why, sir, if the entire commerce, both exports and imports—not the profits, but the entire commerce—came to us as a gift, it would not pay the expenses of our Army alone, and would leave totally unprovided for the expenses of the civil government.

I find also in the budget of revenues and expenses for these islands for the year 1897 that the total income is placed at $17,474,020, and the total expenses at $17,258,145, and I notice that included in the income and assisting to make the total are, proceeds of monopolies $1,222,000, and lottery $1,000,000. Spain is charged with resorting to every expedient and every ingenuity to wring money from these people, and yet, with all this, barely enough is yielded to support the government. With our more beneficent government—and I assume that it would be more beneficent—and with our refusal to license monopolies and lotteries, how would we provide the necessary revenue to conduct our Government?

If we assume the responsibility for the destiny of these people, I suppose it would be a part of our mission to teach them the ways of civilization, to educate them, and lead them up to the higher and better walks of life. Where would the money come from with which to do it? I am told that we now expend about 30

cents per capita on our Indian wards. I do not know that the figures are correct, but suppose we only expend 10 cents per capita each year on the Filipinos, it would take, in round numbers, $1,000,000 per year for this purpose alone. It seems to me, therefore, that in reaching out for the commerce of these islands, so far from materially benefiting our people, we will entail a sore and grievous burden upon them; in my opinion, such a burden as no law of reason or of prudence or of Providence requires at our hands.

Reading further from the literature furnished us, I learn that in the year 1894 about 60 per cent of the foreign trade of these islands was carried in British vessels and only 20 per cent in Spanish vessels. I learn also that Great Britain was the largest consumer of the products of these islands and that we, the United States, consumed three times as much of these products as did Spain. It is true that the gentleman compiling these figures goes on to say that—

With these islands in our possession, and the construction of railroads in the interior of Luzon, it is probable that an enormous extension could be given to this commerce, nearly all of which would come to the United States.

Perhaps it would, and perhaps it would not. It is a free guess for anybody. The fact, however, that is made manifest by these figures, is that in 1894, when we did not own the Philippines, they exported to us three times as much of their products as they exported to Spain and exported more to Great Britain than they did to us.

Do not these figures demonstrate that it is a fallacy that we must own a country and a people in order to trade with them? If we furnish the best market for the Filipinos, will we not buy their goods whether we own them or not? And if they furnish us the best market for our products, we will sell to them no matter what flag they fly. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is strange to me that at this time of all times our people or any portion of them should have conceived the idea that to extend our commerce we must extend our territory, because it has been so recent that we had our attention called to the enormous volume of our foreign commerce. The President in his annual message informs us that—

The combined imports and exports for the year are the largest ever shown in a single year in all our history. Our exports for 1899 alone exceed by more than a billion dollars our imports and exports combined in 1870. The imports per capita are 20 per cent less than in 1870, while the exports per capita are 58 per cent more than in 1870. Exports of agricultural products were $784,776,142. Of manufactured products we exported in value $339,592,146, being larger than any previous year. It is a noteworthy fact that the only year in all our history when the products of our manufactories sold abroad exceeded those bought abroad were 1898 and 1899.

I do not think this the time for any comment upon these figures other than upon the remarkable showing they make of our growing export trade. I will leave to some other occasion to discuss the question of whether or not the decrease in our importations has been due to the advance in the height of our tariff wall, or as to whether this decrease is to the substantial interests of the consumers of the country, or as to whether the increase in our trade generally is due to natural or to artificial causes. I wish now merely to call attention to the fact that in the face of this statement, showing our enormous export trade with people who owe us no allegiance and who do not fly our flag, there are still those who say that we must, in order to increase our export trade, own colonies and govern a dependent people. Such a proposition, in the light of these figures, seems to be absurd.

There is other information, however, that we get from the literature furnished us that is interesting. We are pointed to these islands as offering a great field for development, as being a wilderness of riches, as it were, ready for the hand of America merely to reach out and take in, and yet in the column of facts we are advised that in the island of Luzon there are now 79 people to each square mile: in the island of Leyte, 71; Negros, 73; Panay, 155; Bohol, 188; and Zebu, 210; and we are also told that these six islands comprise the principal islands in all the archipelago. This literature further officially informs us that the density of population in these six islands is 50 per cent greater than it is in the States of Illinois and Indiana, and is greater than that of any of our States east of the Rocky Mountains except Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

We are told, however, that these islands will support a much larger population than they now have; that the population now is only about one-half as great as it is in France and one-third as great as it is in China and Japan. It would be useless to deny this last proposition. It may be true or it may not be true; the proposition is speculation pure and simple. If it be true, however, it must of necessity be equally true that far greater populations can be maintained in our States than now exist. It follows that if we have a surplus of energy and a surplus of capital, we can find here within our own domain riper fields to exploit, a better climate in which to live, and a more homogeneous people to dwell among. Here the hope of success is greater and the chances of failure smaller.

I can understand, Mr. Chairman, how individuals or corporations, few in number, could obtain franchises, rights, and concessions in these islands and exploit the islands to their own satisfaction and to their own profit. I can still better understand how this could be done under an arbitrary and despotic government, with the people exercising no rights and having no power to protect themselves; but I fail to see how our Government or our taxpayers can realize anything from the venture, and I can not give my consent to overturn precedents, traditions, and even our organic law itself to the end simply that a few favored monopolies and individuals may wax and grow fat at the expense of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that the question I was endeavoring to discuss was not political. I still maintain that proposition, and yet gentlemen here and elsewhere have now and then felt called upon to refer to the Democratic party as the party of expansion, and to point to accessions of territory in the past under Democratic Administrations, and have felt it their duty to suggest that Democrats now who oppose the retention of the Philippine Islands are backslidden from the faith of their fathers and deserters from the traditional policy of their party. I respectfully dissent from this view. I believe, and have endeavored to demonstrate, that those who look upon this question as I do are as true to the policies and traditions and the faith of the Democratic party as any who in the days gone by have marched beneath its banner.

I would remind gentlemen who thus attempt to taunt us of the fate that uniformly befell those who in the past offered such taunts. This is not the first time taunts of this kind have been made, and yet through the changing vicissitudes of time Democratic members have been returned here by Democratic constituencies. The records disclose to me that the attitude of the Democratic party on

0 013 744 717 4

the expansion of territory in the past was just as violently and bitterly assailed at the time as is now the attitude of its membership on the pending question, and yet time and reason vindicated and sustained its position, and overwhelmed those who opposed it, and forced them to the acknowledgment that they were wrong; and so, Mr. Chairman, I believe that those who scoff and jeer to-day at our position will in the days to come be forced to admit their error and their wrong, just as their predecessors in the past have been compelled to do.

My hope is that their repentance will not have to be in sackcloth and in ashes at the feet of a crushed and overturned Republic. The Democratic party has stood in the past and stands to-day for expansion—expansion of territory, of commerce, and of freedom, and of all things that are good and great. Wherever under its administration this country has expanded its territory it has carried freedom, liberty, and the Constitution with it. The Democratic party has always believed that "forcible annexation was criminal aggression and not to be thought of." [Applause.] It has believed in "benevolent assimilation" in fact as well as in theory. It has never in the past stood for expansion of territory at the expense of freedom. It has never stood for the curtailment of liberty that commerce might expand. [Applause.]

It has never waged a war of conquest. It has never sought by force of arms to subject an alien people. It has never stood for empire or for colonies, and, so far as I can read the signs of the times, it stands to-day where it has ever stood—the foe of oppression, the enemy of tyranny, the friend of liberty, and the champion of progress. But, Mr. Chairman, regardless of party or party history, when temptation comes to us as a republic and cupidity and avarice arise within us, when great riches seem temptingly near and dreams of imperial splendor dazzle us, we must invoke the aid of the true American spirit and cling to the Constitution with tenacious energy as the sheet anchor of our liberties. If we do not this, we are undone, and that which we have we will have no more, and that which we receive will be but dust and bitterness. [Loud applause.]

4095

O